IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO.2011 OF 2007

Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan ..Petitioner
v/s.
The State of Maharashtra .. Respondents

Mr. S.D. Thokade for the petitioner.
Ms. Poonam P. Bhosale for the respondent No.3.
Ms. M.P. Thakur, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. V.D. Raut for the respondent No.5.
Mr. P.A. Pol for the respondent No.4.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2012 OF 2007

Smt. Usha Shivaji Chavan .. Petitioner
v/s.
The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Mr. V.D. Raut for the petitioner.
Ms. Poonam P. Bhosale for the respondent No.3.
Ms. M.P. Thakur, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. S.B. Thokade for the respondent No.5.
Mr. P.A. Pol for the respondent No.4.

ALONGWITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2028 OF 2007

Smt. Varsha Krishna Desai .. Petitioner
v/s.
The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Mr. P.A. Pol for the petitioner.
Mr. S.D. Thokade for the respondent No.6.
Ms. Poonam P. Bhosale for the respondent No.4.
Mr. P.P. Kakade, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent Nos.1 to 3.
Mr. V.D. Raut for the respondent No.5.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO &
R.M. SAVANT, JJ.

DATED : 26TH MARCH, 2007

P.C.

All the three petitioners were applicants for the rationing shop which has been allotted to one Ms. Sweta Prakash Salvi. One startling fact which emerges that all the three petitioners have given their proposed premises as Vishal General Stores. Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan claims that she has got affidavit from her mother who is the owner. Smt. Varsha Krishna Desai claims that she obtained the said premises from one Subash Anurag Gupta and Smt. Usha Shivaji Chavan claims that she has taken it from one Anna Baburao Chavan. The Controller of Rationing had held in favour of Smt. Pratibha V. Chavan.

2. Three revision applications were filed including Ms. Sweta Prakash Salvi. By order of 23.1.2007, the revision preferred by Kum.

Sweta Prakash Salvi was allowed. The Revisional Authority observed that Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan has not submitted the documents and evidence of her premises and financial condition of the applicant. We had called the learned counsel for Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan to produce the documents. What has been produced before us is an order issued by the Additional Tahasildar, Kurla showing Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan as occupier. In the petition before this court, Smt. Pratibha Vilas Chavan in para 2 sets out that the owner of the premises is the mother. This is clearly contrary to the documents produced before us. There cannot be three different owners for the same premises.

3. We are clearly of the opinion that all the petitioners have produced fraudulent documents and, therefore, this is not a fit case to interfere in our extraordinary jurisdiction. Hence all the petitions are rejected.

(F.I. REBELLO, J.)

(R.M. SAVANT, J.)